

④ HV 5091

.H3T6

Liquor Question in Hawaii--- The Problem to be Solved

WHY PROHIBITION IS THE BEST
METHOD OF REDUCING THE
CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR TO
A MINIMUM. • • • •

By LORRIN A. THURSTON

[At the request of the executive committee of the Hawaiian Prohibition League, Mr. Thurston has prepared a series of articles setting forth the arguments for and against "Prohibition" on the one hand, and "Regulation and High License" on the other. These were printed in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser in installments; collectively they are here presented.]

HONOLULU, T. H.
1910



21

44509
H316

Liquor Question in Hawaii.

How intoxicating liquor is to be dealt with in Hawaii, is now the most vital question before this community.

Nearly every person in the Territory is doing more or less thinking upon this subject. It is essential to clear thinking that the facts which everybody recognizes exist should be segregated and scheduled and the arguments for and against the policy of liquor licensing, as against prohibition of licensing, clearly set forth, so that every man can see them, think them over at leisure and decide for himself.

The following is a statement, as I understand them, of the admitted facts; the arguments in favor of prohibition of the sale or manufacture of liquor in this Territory; the arguments against prohibition and replies thereto. In other words, they constitute the principal data bearing upon the problem now before us for solution.

WHO ARE TO BE CONSIDERED IN SOLVING THE PROBLEM.

There are certain men who admit nothing, agree to nothing, care for nothing but their own selfish ends; who know the law only to seek to evade it. These are the men who run blind pigs when they cannot get a license; and, when they secure a license, sell to drunken men and minors; sell out of hours, and deal in deadly doctored compounds regardless of the murderous consequences; who are in the business simply to make the most money out of it, caring for nothing else.

These men are of the type of, and are to be classed with, professional criminals, and dealt with accordingly. They recognize no law but force; no motive but greed. They and their selfish interests are not to be considered in connection with this problem, except as it becomes necessary to hold them, along with the rest of the criminal class, in check, for the common good. The problem is to be settled by the rest of us.

FACTS ABOUT LIQUOR WHICH GOOD CITIZENS AGREE UPON.

Among disinterested men—those not financially interested in the liquor business, there are certain facts, commonly admitted and agreed upon, as follows:

1. That intoxicating liquor is the cause of much if not most of the sin, crime, misery and poverty of society.
 2. That it is impossible entirely to prevent the consumption of liquor; but the welfare of society requires legislation with a view to reducing its use to the lowest practicable minimum.
 3. The present law, in its administration, is not satisfactorily accomplishing this result.
- 2 -

THE PROBLEM FOR SOLUTION.

On these admitted facts, the problem now presented to the people of Hawaii for solution is: "How can the use of liquor be best reduced to the lowest practicable minimum in order that sin, crime, misery and poverty may likewise be reduced?"

At this point there is disagreement.

Some say that the consumption of liquor will best be reduced by "regulating" its sale; in other words, by licensing it.

Others say that the best way to reduce the amount of liquor consumed is to stop permitting its sale.

For many years the "regulation" method of reducing liquor consumption has been in force in Hawaii.

It is now proposed to try the "no license," or, in other words, the "prohibition of selling" method. It is up to the people of Hawaii to decide which method they think will best secure the desired result.

REASONS WHY PROHIBITION OF THE SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR IS THE BEST METHOD OF REDUCING ITS CONSUMPTION TO THE LOWEST PRACTICABLE MINIMUM.

Remember, always, that the problem is not "how to abolish drinking"; but "how to reduce liquor drinking to the lowest practicable minimum."

1. THE REMOVAL OF OPPORTUNITY TO DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUORS IS THE MOST EFFICIENT MEANS OF REDUCING DRINKING TO A MINIMUM.

If all the liquor in the world was blotted out of existence, and no more was made, that would remove all opportunity to drink, and completely and effectively abolish drinking.

It is impossible to blot out liquor, so the next best thing must be done to "reduce drinking to the lowest practicable minimum."

If a man has to seek the opportunity to drink, he will be less likely to drink than he will if he is given the opportunity.

In other words, make it difficult to get liquor, and a man is less liable to drink than if it is easy to get it. The greater the difficulty, the less the liability.

"Out of sight, out of mind," applies as well to liquor as it does, as a rule, to other things.

A BEEFSTEAK ILLUSTRATION.

Suppose a meat diet is injurious to a man who is fond of beef, and the doctor recommends cutting it out and substituting a vegetarian bill of fare. What would be the best method of securing the latter diet?

Would it be by broiling a delicious porterhouse steak to a luscious brown, putting it on a plate with a knife and fork and setting it on the table in front of that man when he was hungry, and allowing the appetizing flavors to waft over his longing palate; or by keeping the meat off the table and placing before him a liberal bill of fare of fruit and vegetables?

H. M. Ballou

1890

Is not the man more likely to eat that meat, cooked, savory and on the table, than he is if it is not there at all?

It may be said that if he eats the meat it indicates a weak character. This may or may not be so. That is "another story" to be considered later.

STICK TO THE TEXT.

The question NOW under consideration is "how to reduce the drinking of intoxicating liquor to the least practicable minimum." Let us stick to the text.

A COCKTAIL ILLUSTRATION.

Apply the above illustration of the meat eater, to the liquor drinker.

It is elemental that most men like liquor in some form; many crave it; a large number can not resist its lure. It is injurious to most men; deadly to a large percentage; nearly all would be better off without it.

Under these circumstances, what is the best method of cutting liquor out of a man's diet?

Is it by putting a cocktail under his nose, and letting its pungent and seductive flavor entice his appetite, especially with a lot of jolly companions present, administering punishment to other cocktails?

Is he not more likely to take a drink under such circumstances, than he is if no liquor is present?

THE AVERAGE MAN.

If the man in the illustration is more liable to drink a cocktail, under the circumstances named, than if no liquor is present, equally certain is it that the generality of men are more likely to drink liquor if there is a convenient saloon at hand, than if there is no saloon.

The average man is more liable to drink if there is a saloon on the way home, than if he has to walk two blocks out of his way to reach one.

He is more liable to take a drink if he can reach a saloon by walking two blocks, than if he has to walk a mile.

He is more liable not to drink at all, if there is no saloon available.

OPPORTUNITY THE CHIEF CAUSE OF DRINKING.

In other words, opportunity is the chief cause of yielding to temptation. Remove the opportunity and the temptation disappears. Diminish the temptation and the man drinks less frequently. Remove the temptation and the man does not drink.

Set the steak on the table and the man eats it. Remove the steak and as a rule the man no longer thinks of it and does not eat it.

Furnish cocktails and good company and the cocktail goes down red lane. No cocktail in sight, no cocktail is consumed.

Gridiron a man's pathway with saloons, with the odor of alcohol drifting across the sidewalk to his nostrils, and the friendly invitation to "come on,

boys, and take a drink," with the sight of his companions accepting the invitation, and the most natural thing in the world is to go in and take a drink with them.

No saloon and the man, as a rule, will not think of liquor; but will go home and kiss his wife without paralyzing her with a whisky breath.

CORRECTNESS OF THIS REASONING DEMONSTRATED.

The absolute correctness of the foregoing reasoning is demonstrated by the fact that everywhere, when whisky has become rampant and troublesome, and it is desired to bring it within bounds, the first thing done is to reduce the number of saloons. **WHY?**

There is only one reason; one answer: **BECAUSE THE LESS SALOONS, THE LESS DRINKING.**

Why the less saloons, the less drinking?

There is only one reason; one answer: **BECAUSE THE LESS SALOONS, THE LESS OPPORTUNITY. THE LESS OPPORTUNITY, THE LESS TEMPTATION. THE LESS TEMPTATION, THE LESS YIELDING. THE LESS YIELDING, THE LESS LIQUOR DRUNK, AND THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM IS REACHED, viz:**

THE WAY TO "REDUCE LIQUOR DRINKING TO THE LEAST PRACTICABLE MINIMUM" IS TO REDUCE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR GETTING LIQUOR TO A MINIMUM—in other words, ABOLISH THE SALOONS.

REASONING OF ANTIPROHIBITIONISTS LEADS TO SAME RESULT.

The reasoning of the antiprohibitionists themselves leads directly to this same result. Not the reasoning of the blind pig keeper and his twin brother, that brand of saloonkeeper who does not care what happens to the buyer and whose sole motive is to make money for himself; but the reasoning of those who agree with the prohibitionists that it is desirable to "reduce drinking to its lowest practicable minimum."

THE ELEMENTS OF REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE.

These conscientious antiprohibitionists say:

1. Restrict the sale of liquor by prohibiting its sale except to those who hold a license.
2. Issue only a few licenses.
3. Make the licenses high.

This they call "limiting the sale of liquor by regulation and high license."

THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPLE OF REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE.

What is the underlying principle involved in this interference with the "natural right" of everybody to sell liquor?

Why will licensing improve the situation?

The reply is, that the underlying principle is simply, solely and only, that

if everybody may sell liquor, there will be more "opportunity" to get it; and, there being more opportunity, more liquor will be drunk.

Why does limiting the number of saloons to a few, help to decrease drinking?

Simply, solely and only, because with many saloons there are many opportunities to drink. With few saloons, there are few opportunities, and consequently less liquor is drunk.

WHY HIGH LICENSE HELPS DECREASE DRINKING.

Why does "high license" help to decrease drinking?

There are two reasons, viz:

First, because the higher the license, the fewer licenses will be issued; because more men can afford to take out licenses at \$100, than if the licenses cost \$1000 each.

There is no mysterious virtue in "high license." There is no secret reason why it reduces the consumption of liquor.

The patent, open and only reason is that, like prohibition, it reduces the number of places where liquor can be obtained.

In other words, it lessens the opportunities for getting liquor.

ANOTHER REASON.

The second reason why high license lessens the consumption of liquor is, that it raises the price of drinks, so that a given sum of money buys less liquor.

If a man has only a dollar to spend, he can buy five drinks at 20 cents each; whereas he can buy ten drinks if they cost only 10 cents each. Consequently he can get only five drinks at the high price, instead of ten at the low price, and high license has reduced that man's consumption by one-half.

In other words, it has reduced his "opportunity" for drinking, by lessening the purchasing power of his money.

NO DIFFERENCE IN PRINCIPLE BETWEEN HIGH LICENSE AND PROHIBITION.

There is, therefore, no difference in the principle involved between high license and prohibition. There is only a difference in degree.

High license lessens drinking by lessening the opportunities to drink; but still leaves some saloons; in other words, some opportunities.

The prohibitionist argues that, if lessening opportunities lessens drinking, and lessening drinking is the object sought, then why leave any opportunities which can be removed?

If abolishing SOME saloons lessens drinking, then why not abolish ALL the saloons and lessen drinking still more?

HIGH LICENSE FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.

In other words, high license advocates admit the principle that reduction in opportunities to drink lessens drinking. They then proceed to prohibit all men from selling liquor except those who hold a license. Then they arbitrarily reduce the number of licenses to a few, so that many who would like to engage in the business are unable to do so. They then arbitrarily and intentionally put the price of a license so high that still fewer can afford to hold one, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, raise the price of liquor so high that the "poor man" can get less liquor for his money.

INTERFERENCES WITH LIBERTY.

In the face of all these arbitrary "interferences with liberty," they roll their eyes to heaven and condemn the prohibitionists for interfering with the "freedom" of mankind. They declaim, with patriotic virtue, that they would "rather be free than sober." They scornfully refer to "Puritans" and thank God that they are not as other men are, while all the time they are working along exactly the same lines that the prohibitionists are working, viz: Legislating in such manner as to deprive the great majority of citizens of their "natural right" to sell and drink liquor freely, with the object of "reducing the drinking of liquor to its lowest practicable minimum," by reducing the opportunities to get it.

DIFFERENCE NOT IN PRINCIPLE BUT IN DEGREE.

The difference between high license and prohibition is not in principle, but in degree.

The high license advocate stops half way. He would only remove a part of the opportunities—a part of the saloons.

The prohibitionist follows the principle to its logical conclusion, and advocates the removal of other opportunities—the remaining saloons.

The high licenser "sends a boy when a man is needed," and trumps with a two spot, the second hand around.

The prohibitionist proposes to play the game by trumping with a high card.

The prohibitionist proposes to guard the barn with a bulldog. The high licenser with a puppy. Both choose the same means. The difference is that the dog is more efficient than the pup.

The one digs up the noxious plant by the roots and destroys the evil fruit.

The other prunes some of the branches and leaves the remainder to produce their kind.

The one secures results; the other plays at reform and accomplishes little.

BLIND PIGS.

But, says the antiprohibitionist, in reply to the foregoing, abolishing saloons does not abolish opportunity and temptation. The blind pigs take their place.

The reply to this objection is, that no one claims that abolishing the saloon will abolish drinking. That condition will obtain only when the millenium arrives.

REMEMBER THE TEXT.

Remember the text; the problem is not "how to abolish liquor drinking"; but "how to reduce drinking to the least practicable minimum."

The conscientious antiprohibitionists admit that the less the number of saloons the less the drinking; that is, the less the opportunity to drink, the less the amount drunk; otherwise why do they advocate limiting the number of saloons?

By the same process of reasoning, a saloon openly located on the public street, selling under protection of the law and the police, gives more opportunity—is a greater temptation to drink, than is a secret blind pig in a back alley, under the ban of the law and in fear of the police.

In other words, the fewer the saloons the less opportunity. But any lawful public saloon affords more opportunity to drink than does an outlawed place of sale, requiring concealment as a price of its existence.

Consequently, the fact that blind pigs will exist under prohibition, even in the same numbers that they now exist under regulation, does not negative the reasoning that prohibition of the saloon will "reduce the drinking of liquor to its lowest practicable minimum."

"REGULATION" OF SALOONS DOES NOT REMEDY THE EVIL SOUGHT TO BE OVERCOME, BECAUSE IT STILL PROVIDES THE OPPORTUNITY TO DRINK ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR. It is, in the last analysis, the alcohol in liquor which kills.

In 1888, William L. Green was minister of finance of the Kingdom of Hawaii. He had been for many years connected with the wholesale liquor business. Charges had been made that certain liquor dealers "doctored" their liquor, adulterating it with fusel-oil and other poisons, and the question was being discussed by the cabinet whether licenses should be refused to the offenders. After listening to the discussion for some time, Mr. Green said:

THE CHIEF POISON IN LIQUOR IS ALCOHOL.

"I have been in the liquor business myself for about forty years and I know what I am talking about. Take my word for it, gentlemen, the chief poison in liquor is alcohol, and the principal adulterant is water."

THE KEYNOTE OF THE WHOLE LIQUOR QUESTION IS, THAT ALCOHOL IS A POISON!

In the words of Mr. Green, "the chief poison in liquor is alcohol." Whatever other injurious ingredients are eliminated from liquor, so long as alcohol remains, the power for harm remains.

In the words of Dr. Brinckerhoff, alcohol is a "habit-creating, character-destroying drug."

BISHOP RESTARICK AND ALCOHOL AS A FOOD.

Bishop Restarick refers to an experiment by Professor Atwater, in which a man was shut up in a complicated apparatus and given small quantities of alcohol under careful observation. Chemical analysis of his breath and perspiration showed that a part of the alcohol was oxidized in the body, from which the conclusion followed that alcohol has food properties, and should be treated and legislated about as a food and not as a poison.

ON A PAR WITH A RATTLESNAKE AS A DOMESTIC ANIMAL.

This argument is as far-fetched as it would be to catalog a rattlesnake as a domestic animal, because its skin is sometimes used to make ladies' belts, and its liver is tried out to make "snake oil," as a remedy for warts and rheumatism.

Incidentally portions of a rattlesnake may be used for domestic and medicinal purposes; but primarily it is a poisonous reptile, and mankind and common sense recognize and classify it as such.

MORPHINE, STRYCHNINE AND ARSENIC.

Incidentally, morphine and cocaine are alleviators of pain.

Incidentally, strychnine is used as a tonic to tone up the nerves.

Incidentally, arsenic is used to bleach the complexion of certain ladies.

Primarily, however, all of these substances are poisons; recognized, branded and legislated about, as such.

Whisky is likewise, incidentally, a stimulant.

For the purpose of the argument, we may admit that whisky contains food properties.

Such facts do not, however, make whisky a subject to be primarily considered and treated as food; any more than the fact that metal contains water, makes a cart load of scrap iron a proper source of water supply for the city waterworks.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ALCOHOL AND OTHER POISONS.

The chief differences between alcohol and the other poisons above enumerated, are:

(1) That by custom, its consumption has become an accompaniment—an emblem of hospitality and good cheer, which disguises and keeps out of sight in the background, the after effect.

(2) That it is slower in its ultimate action, than are most other deadly poisons.

(3) That for the foregoing and other reasons, its character as a poison has not been recognized until recently.

It is only within a hundred years or so, that any organized opposition to the use of alcohol as a beverage has come into existence.

TIPSY PARSONS AND PURITAN RUM JUGS.

It is within the same period that nothing the worse was thought of a Church of England divine who became tipsy at a good dinner; and Puritan preachers reverently passed around the rum jug to the accompaniment of "Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow."

PRIMARY ELEMENT OF SPARKLING CHAMPAGNE AND STINKING SWIPES.

It has been a long, slow process to educate mankind to acknowledge that the primary element of sparkling champagne, the pure juice of the grape, manufactured in sunny France, is a poison and the same as the primary element of stinking swipes, made from refuse molasses and rotten potatoes, brewed in the slums of Kakaako.

FACTS NOT EVEN YET ASSIMILATED BY HIGHMINDED MEN.

Many highly educated, philanthropic and highminded men, as, for example, Bishop Restarick, have not even yet assimilated these facts; although they are matters of demonstration.

For example—take the alcohol out of Kakaako swipes and the blind pig patron would spit it out in disgust.

Take the alcohol out of champagne, and the swallow-tailed, low neck and short sleeved revelers would turn their glasses down when the five dollars a quart French beverage came around, and take five cent Honolulu soda water instead.

ALCOHOL THE COMMON LURE.

It is the alcohol that is the common lure.

It is the poison of alcohol that drives the swipes guzzler to his squalid home to murder his wife.

It is the same poison, disguised in fine clothes, that has dragged down to destruction man after man, and even women, from the best families and the highest places in every community.

W. L. GREEN SPOKE GOD'S ETERNAL TRUTH.

William L. Green was ahead of his time; but he announced God's eternal truth when he said: "The chief poison in liquor is alcohol."

THE FATAL WEAKNESS IN REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE.

The failure to recognize that "ALCOHOL IS PRIMARILY A POISON," IS THE POINT OF FATAL WEAKNESS IN THE "REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE" PROGRAM.

The "regulation and high license" advocate admits practically every charge that the prohibitionist makes against liquor. He admits that it produces

sin, misery, suffering and poverty; that it is beneficial to society to reduce the consumption of liquor by reducing the opportunities for buying it; which result he would achieve by limiting the right to sell, to those holding licenses; and further, by arbitrarily permitting only a few licenses; and still further by putting the license price so high as to freeze out all but a few would-be dealers. All this he admits, and all these interferences with personal liberty he not only countenances but advocates; but he stops short of the logical conclusion that, if the partial prohibition of saloons to decrease drinking is just and right, the total prohibition is also just and right and proportionately more effective.

THE "PURE LIQUOR" FALLACY.

He further argues that regulation will restrict the saloons to selling "pure" liquor.

Admit it! Then what? "Pure" liquor does not contain fusel-oil, or arsenic, or opium, or tobacco juice; but it does contain alcohol, and it is the alcohol in the liquor which does the mischief! It may take a less quantity of molasses swipes than of three star brandy to make a man fighting drunk, but in each case it is the alcohol that does the business. It makes no difference whether the "drunk" comes from drinking swipes or brandy, it is the alcohol in the liquor which turns a man, made in the image of God, into a slobbering imbecile or a murderous maniac.

SWIPES AND BRANDY HARMLESS IF MINUS ALCOHOL.

Distil the alcohol out of the swipes, and the poor devil who drinks a gallon of it will be as harmless as a purring kitten, with nothing worse to show for his excess than a bad breath, an evil taste in his mouth and a possible stomach ache.

Abstract the alcohol from the brandy and the devoted club man will "walk a crack" on his way home after a "night with the boys," insert the latchkey without help, get to bed without calling down domestic lightning on his head and go to business on time the next morning, with a head of normal size.

IMPURE LIQUOR A SCAPEGOAT.

The hue and cry after "impure" liquor, is off on a false scent.

"Impure" liquor is a scapegoat.

"Impure" liquor is an "undesirable." It ought to go. It is a proper subject to war against; but, after all, it is a comparatively unimportant factor in the fight against the drink evil. The real enemy is alcohol.

A MONGOOSE AS COMPARED TO A BENGAL TIGER.

The damage to mankind done by "impure" liquor, as compared to "pure" alcohol, is as a mongoose catching stray chickens, compared to a Bengal tiger turned loose in the barnyard. The mongoose is a sneaking annoyance; but the

tiger is a beast with claws and teeth, the embodiment of death and destruction, which must be killed or caged before there can be safety on the farm.

“REGULATION” ADVOCATES AND CHARACTER BUILDING.

The “Regulation and High License” advocates, with great earnestness and sincerity, demand the hide of the mongoose, “impure” liquor; but instead of putting the tiger, alcohol, out of business, they propose to “stake him out,” with a rope long enough to reach half the farm; and they justify this course by the plea that dodging the tiger will “build up the characters” of the farm hands, and educate them into self-reliance.

THE CLEANLINESS AND ORDER FALLACY.

THE SECOND “REGULATION AND HIGH LICENSE” FALLACY is, that cleanliness, and order, and police supervision, in and over the saloons, will remedy the evil.

Will it?

Let us analyze the situation.

Cleanliness is a good thing. If the problem were “how to clean up the city,” scrubbing the floors of the saloons with sapolio, putting a coat of fresh paint on the walls and retouching the begrimed portraits of harem beauties which adorn the walls, would be an excellent step—one of the proper things to do; along with disinfecting Chinatown and cleaning up the gutters, cesspools and other pest holes.

But, as Kipling says, “that’s another story.”

STICK TO THE TEXT.

Let us stick to the text.

The particular problem which conscientious, sincere men and women are now trying to solve, is: “How to reduce the drinking of intoxicating liquor to the lowest practicable minimum.”

THE ANTIPROHIBITIONIST REMEDY.

The antiprohibitionist solution is, first, high license; second, “make the saloon clean and orderly.”

The reply to this is that, while dirt and disorder are undesirable conditions, they are not what kill in connection with the liquor business!

A given quantity of alcoholic liquor, under whatever name, served in a cutglass goblet, on a silver salver, by a barkeeper with a rosebud in his button-hole, and a pompadour haircut, will make the consumer just as drunk as though he drank it out of a grimy tin dipper, served by a barefooted, frowsy-haired tough, dressed in overalls and a ragged sweater.

It is the “alcohol, not the dirt, which kills.”

Prohibiting "impure" liquor does not decrease the opportunity to drink "pure" alcohol. Neither does requiring that the "pure" liquor be drunk in a clean and orderly place, decrease that opportunity.

An orderly community is a more desirable place to live in than a riotous one; and if we were in danger of mob violence, one of the first and eminently proper steps to take would be to maintain order in the saloons, or close them entirely.

But, again, as in the case of cleanliness, order is a most desirable status to strive for; but the securing of order is not primarily the problem for which we are now seeking a solution.

ALCOHOL—NOT DIRT AND DISORDER—THE PROBLEM.

The problem under discussion is "How to reduce drinking intoxicating liquor to the lowest practicable minimum."

Alcohol, not dirt, is the common enemy which we are now seeking to circumvent.

Alcohol, not boisterous conduct, is the thing which steals men's brains away and converts a peaceful citizen into a murderous beast.

A MASTERPIECE OF ILLOGIC.

The proposition to remedy the evils wrought by alcohol, and solely by alcohol, by enacting laws which simply require that the alcohol shall be pure, and that it shall be sold in a clean and orderly place, under police supervision; but which still permits it to be freely sold to all comers, is so illogical, so preposterously inadequate to accomplish the announced intention, that nothing but the respectability of some of its advocates, the number of times that it has been repeated, and the number of people who want to believe it, keeps it from being laughed out of court.

The proposition is a masterpiece of illogic.

Here is an analysis of the "Regulation and High License" process of reasoning:

"Intoxicating liquor contains alcohol. Alcohol is a poison. We therefore want to 'reduce the consumption of alcoholic liquor to the lowest practicable limit,' so as to minimize the effect of the poison.

"How shall we do it?

"Stop permitting the open public sale of it?

PURIFIED AND REGULATED POISON.

"Great Heavens, No! Purify the liquor of every poison but alcohol; serve this purified alcohol in a clean glass, in a clean saloon, kept orderly by rules and regulations, with a policeman to enforce them. Then put this purified, clean and regulated poison on public sale, and we will have accomplished all that we can to reduce the consumption of intoxicating liquor to its lowest practicable minimum!"

How is that for logic?

The same general procedure, under the pure food law, results in increasing the sale of the scores of articles which secure a government certificate that they are pure and clean and put up according to Hoyle !

Like causes produce like results.

If the sale of 99 out of a 100 articles is increased, instead of decreased, by official certificate of purity, cleanliness and order, it is logical to conclude that the sale of the hundredth article will also be increased; and it is sheer simple-mindedness to claim that its consumption will be thereby "decreased to the lowest practicable minimum."

CONUNDRUM FOR THE FEEBLE-MINDED.

The same logic would reduce the ravages of a man-eating tiger to the lowest practicable minimum by bringing him in out of the jungle, picketing him out on the village street corner, currying his fur down, washing his paws, and setting a policeman to keep tab on his victims.

Conundrum for feeble-minded folk to solve:

Would the "regulated and purified" tiger, staked out in the village, catch more or less men than if he had been left in the jungle and unceasingly hunted by the full village forces ?

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROHIBITION.

The following are the principal points and arguments against the policy of prohibiting the sale of liquor, which have come to my attention. Several of the points have been incidentally discussed in previous articles on the liquor question; but they are summarized here, for the purpose of getting all of the points together, for more comprehensive analysis and consideration:

FIRST POINT AGAINST PROHIBITION.

"IT IS WRONG, 'UNMORAL,' TO TRY, BY MAJORITY VOTE, TO FORCE PROHIBITION UPON THE MINORITY OF THE CITIZENS OF THE TERRITORY, AGAINST THEIR WILL, EVEN IF THE MAJORITY ARE IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION.

"IF PROHIBITION IS TO BE TRIED AT ALL, IT SHOULD BE VOTED ON BY DISTRICTS OR PRECINCTS. LOCAL OPTION, NOT TERRITORIAL PROHIBITION, SHOULD BE THE COURSE PURSUED."

REPLY TO POINT ONE.

The "rule of the majority" is the fundamental principle of a republican form of government. More particularly is it the fundamental principle of the United States government, for, in the United States only, of all the republics of the world, has the doctrine of "majority rule" become so well established that minorities, no matter how strong, no longer think of resisting by force the decision of the majority.

A majority vote in the party primaries selects candidates for election.

It elects every legislative member of every municipality and state, and of the national house of representatives. It elects the President of the United States; the Governor of every State and the mayor of every city and village in the Union.

These elected legislative officers in turn enact the laws which control the lives, liberties and property of every man, woman and child in the nation—minority as well as majority.

The executive officers, elected by the majority, have the entire charge and control of the execution of the laws, with vast discretionary powers, which are capable of being most oppressively enforced in favor of, or against, given individuals or classes in society.

From no responsible source has any suggestion been made, however, that the principle of "majority rule" should be abandoned because sometimes it works hardship or injustice on individuals or minorities.

On the other hand, although it is manifest that frequently the majority are wrong, and the minority right; and further that majority rule is sometimes correctly characterized as the "rule of the incompetent," and that it by no means produces an ideal government; still, in the long run, it has been found to furnish the freest, fairest and least oppressive of any form of government which the wit of man has yet conceived.

Why the opponents of the prohibition of the sale of liquor should have been suddenly convinced of the inherent viciousness of the principle of "majority rule," as applied to this extremely minor phase of government, when no protest is raised against "majority rule" and laws made by the majority which vitally affect a vast number of rights, powers and privileges of infinitely greater consequence than the right to freely drink alcoholic liquor, is a mystery which is left to the antiprohibitionists to elucidate.

SECOND REPLY TO POINT ONE.

A further conundrum in logic is presented by the antiprohibitionists who wax righteously indignant over the proposition to permit the majority of the voters of the Territory as a whole, to decide what the liquor policy of the Territory shall be; but who tacitly, and in some cases enthusiastically, approve of the Local Option phase of the question, by acquiescing in or advocating the rule of the majority on the respective islands or in the respective districts or precincts.

If it is wrong, "unmoral," and tyrannical for a majority to dictate to a minority in the Territory as a whole, why is it not equally so for the majority on any island, or in any district or precinct, to likewise impose its will on an unwilling minority in the smaller division?

Is there any difference in principle between 5001 men out of 10,000, formulating the laws for the entire 10,000; and 501 out of 1000 dictating the laws for the entire 1000, or 51 out of 100 deciding what shall be done by the entire 100?

The principle of "majority rule" is identical, whether it is exercised in the nation, the state, the municipality, the district, the precinct, or any smaller possible political division.

The logic of the man who froths at the mouth over the "injustice" of territorial prohibition, as being the "tyranny of the majority," but who welcomes precinct prohibition, as a proper function of government, is on a par with the man who proclaims that it is felony to steal a clock, but praiseworthy to get away with a watch.

There is no question but that, in certain cases, as a matter of policy, it is preferable to subdivide a state into sections, where there is marked differences of opinion, in conditions and in difficulties of enforcement of the law; as, for example, the City of New York as distinguished from the country districts of the State.

There is no question of right or wrong, justice or tyranny or "unmorality" in such division, however. It is a pure question of policy and expediency for the best accomplishment of desired results under widely differing conditions.

THIRD REPLY TO POINT ONE.

The argument that instead of territorial prohibition we should seek local option, is not ingenuous on the part of many who now loudly advocate it.

At the last session of the Hawaiian legislature, a local option bill was introduced in the senate. That legislative body was under the control of the interests which are now opposing territorial prohibition, and advocating a local option plan as being the fair and proper method of presenting the proposition.

If local option is a good proposition now, why was it not equally good last year, when the legislature could have put it into force and satisfied those who are now advocating total prohibition, of their sincerity and good faith?

"When the devil was sick, the devil a saint would be;

When the devil was well, the devil a saint was he."

What guarantee have we that those who are now smitten with admiration for local option will stay smitten when the next legislature meets? By that time is there not a probability, judging from the past, that they may have a relapse and discover that it is "unmoral" for a precinct majority to tyrannize over the precinct minority?

SECOND POINT AGAINST PROHIBITION.

"PROHIBITION WILL HURT BUSINESS."

REPLY TO POINT TWO.

There is no question that prohibition will hurt the liquor business; but will it hurt the general business of the community?

There is one phase of the liquor business, which, if I personally had had the drafting of the joint resolution under which we are to vote, I think I should

have drawn differently, viz: The clause in the resolution which prohibits the manufacture as well as the sale of intoxicating liquor. This provision will put out of business the brewery in Honolulu and two or three small wineries in the country districts.

It will be a hardship on the owners of these enterprises to be forced out of business; but, as we are not permitted to divide the question submitted to us, but must vote upon it as a whole, the greatest good to the greatest number must be our guiding star; and from this standpoint, the damage to the few manufacturers of intoxicating liquor in Hawaii sinks into insignificance as compared with the advantages accruing to the Territory by reducing the consumption of intoxicating liquor to the lowest practicable minimum.

There is scarce any law passed and put into execution for the general public good, that does not injuriously affect some one. This does not and should not, however, prevent the enactment of such laws.

As to these individuals, there is nothing in the joint resolution which will prevent the legislature, in its discretion, making them compensation for the property taken away from them, although the principle has never been admitted in the United States, that dealers in intoxicating liquor have any claim for damages upon being legislated out of existence; it having been long ago established that dealing in intoxicating liquor is primarily in the nature of a nuisance, to be regulated, or legislated out of existence, at the will of the people in the exercise of their sovereign police powers, for the protection of the community.

As to the ordinary saloon businesses throughout the Territory, is there any logical reason why they should be any more tenderly dealt with now than they have been during the past fifty years? Scores of licenses have been, during that period, revoked, or renewals have been refused, without any regard to the private interests of the specific saloon keepers, or suggestion of compensation being made to them on account of prohibition principles being enforced so far as they were individually concerned.

As to other business, what reason is there for believing that it will be injured by diverting the wages and salaries and other income of thousands of men, which now goes for a useless luxury, sold by a few, into expenditures for food, clothing, furniture, buildings, lands and other necessities and conveniences of every day life?

There will be a few individuals, now engaged in and about saloons, who will be temporarily thrown out of employment; but they will speedily readjust themselves to the changed conditions. There are very few of them who would not welcome some other line of business.

Certainly the merchants, the provision dealers, the stock brokers and the real estate men should have no complaint coming, concerning a measure which will make a couple of hundred thousand dollars or so a month available for expenditure or investment in their several lines!

Instead of there being less money under prohibition, there will be more money for investment and expenditure in every legitimate line of business in Honolulu; and that will benefit, not injure, business.

In addition to the above reason for improvement of business under prohibition, there will be more money to spend by the workmen of the city, for the reason that, with the diminishing of drunkenness incident to the going out of existence of the saloons, there will be fewer days lost from work, and consequently the workmen will have more money to spend at the end of each month than they now do.

Moreover, the decrease of drunkenness will heavily decrease the necessity for police, jails, and jury trials, which now eat up so large a proportion of the taxes, resulting in a decrease of taxation, or an increase in the amount of taxes available for schools, hospitals and the construction of needed public works.

THIRD POINT AGAINST PROHIBITION.

“PROHIBITION WILL DRIVE AWAY TOURISTS.”

REPLY TO POINT THREE.

Prohibition will drive away tourists, if tourists come for the purpose of getting liquor, or if that is one of their main objects in coming to Hawaii.

We have an active, wide-awake promotion committee, eager to attract tourists by presenting to them all the objects and subjects which Hawaii contains, which they think the tourist will be interested in.

What do the promotion committee advertise?

Do they announce in display type, that Hawaii has first-class barrooms; or that it produces beer “brewed to suit the climate”; or that “dago red” can be bought so cheaply that three drinks can be secured for a quarter; or that such pungent swipes are distilled that one swallow will do the business, even though one swallow does not make a summer?

Do they even make a reference to the subject, in small type, on the back page, as being one of the minor attractions of the Territory? If not, why not?

Surely, if the absence of liquor is going to drive tourists away, the fact that it is obtainable here in all its forms, from pure alcohol to the most fantastic combination of fusel-oil and tobacco juice; from champagne to swipes, to suit all palates and tastes, should at least be mentioned in a modest way!

The fact is that prohibition will not drive away tourists.

The average tourist is not a drinking man, at least to the extent that he has such an itching gullet for whisky that he will stay away from Hawaii if saloons are not permitted here.

Look on the tables of the ocean steamers running between San Francisco and Honolulu, and you will find scarce a bottle of liquor at either breakfast, lunch or dinner.

Look on the tables of the Young Hotel, the Moana or the Union Grill and only occasionally will wine or liquor be seen.

The fact is that the great majority of American tourists, and it is the American tourists that chiefly come to Hawaii, do not habitually use liquor. They drink at entertainments, largely because it is the custom so to do and because it is set before them.

Aside from a few chronics who drink cocktails before breakfast; who would not go to heaven unless assured that there was a bar there, tourists do not come to Hawaii to get a drink, and the vast majority of them will continue to come to Hawaii just the same, if champagne and cocktails are no longer available, as they now do when such luxuries are available but seldom used.

Tourists are attracted to Hawaii because of the incomparable climate; the magnificent mountains; the vast volcano; the fine roads; the picturesque surf riding; the swimming at Waikiki; the invigorating auto trips around the several islands. For rest and the indescribable charm of the moonlight at Haleiwa; the rainbows of Manoa and the tropic forests of the volcano road!

That such is the case is demonstrated that these are the features which the promotion committee emphasizes in its literature and which newspaper and magazine writers enthuse over in their home correspondence.

"Out of the heart the mouth speaketh," is gospel truth.

If the lure of Primo, or the delicate aroma of Buchly's compounds were what attracted tourists to Hawaii, would we not have heard at least one peep from at least one imbibing admirer?

Prohibition does not drive away tourists.

The greatest tourist resort in the United States is Southern California. Tourists travel there from all over the Union and all over the world by the hundreds of thousands, every year.

Southern California has grown rich and is rapidly growing richer out of the tourist business, with an enormous percentage of tourists who settle down and become permanent residents.

In the face of the undeniable facts there is the equally undeniable fact that, outside of Los Angeles, almost every municipality and county in Southern California prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors.

A law which does not drive tourists away from Southern California will not drive them away from Hawaii.

So far from prohibition being a bar to tourists in Southern California, it is one of the chief drawing cards which is advertised and made a feature of in inducing tourists to cease their wanderings and become permanent residents.

No man likes a saloon in the immediate vicinity of his home, and this sentiment applies to tourists who may become settlers, as well as to those who have already settled down.

The series of bloody murders, directly traceable to drink, which have recently disgraced the fair fame of Hawaii, are far more likely to drive away tourists than will be the reputation that we have a peaceful, sober, law-abiding

population, undisturbed and unterrorized by men with guns, made irresponsible by drink.

Prohibition will not drive away tourists; it will draw tourists. Hawaii is destined to become one of the great and famous tourist resorts of the world, even if the sale of liquor is not prohibited here. It will be an equally great tourist resort, and what is more important, a great tourist residence community, if alcoholic drinking is "reduced to the lowest practicable minimum."

FOURTH POINT AGAINST PROHIBITION.

A FIRST-CLASS HOTEL CANNOT EXIST IN HAWAII, WITHOUT THE RIGHT TO SELL LIQUOR.

REPLY TO FOURTH POINT.

To the statement that a first-class hotel cannot be operated in Hawaii, without a bar attached, the reply is that no one can know whether this is correct until it is tried.

Certainly, first-class hotels, and plenty of them, exist in Southern California, in Texas and in Kansas, where prohibition laws are in effect; and the well nigh unanimous testimony from those sections where prohibition is enforced the strictest is, that the prosperity of those several communities was never so great as it has been under prohibition, and general prosperity does not single out the hotels and dodge them.

The same kind of American citizens that patronize first-class hotels in the States and communities named, patronize and will continue to patronize the first-class hotels in Hawaii.

The assertion that a first-class hotel cannot exist without a snake-bite-antidote attachment, might be taken as a matter of course in Arizona, the land of the tarantula, the hair trigger and the whisky straight; although Texas, her next door neighbor, who recently successfully competed for priority in the foregoing festive accomplishments, has successfully bottled up the demon rum, and is still able to furnish all comers with three square meals a day.

But to solemnly declaim as the final word—a declaration of law and gospel—that a purveyor of good food can not make both ends meet unless he can also furnish booze on the side, is on a par with a claim that a dry goods merchant can not sell a silk dress unless he can throw in a pair of boots on the side.

Are people going to stop eating because booze is banished?

Are they going to crave tender cuts and broiled frogs' legs any the less because the passageway between the Union Grill and Cunha's art gallery is walled up?

Are not the chances that forced economy at the liquid end of the bill of fare, will provide more money with which to tickle the palate with more substantial luxuries?

In view of the many and substantial benefits to be derived from curbing the "rum devil," and his omnivorous appetite for human life, is it not worth taking a chance that the hotels will survive, even though some of the "chicken-fixins" have to be marked off the bill of fare, and the patrons reduced to the extremity of living on plainer fare, which will still be more elaborate than 99 per cent of us get at home, and thrive on ?

POINT FIVE AGAINST PROHIBITION.

THIS IS A SEAPORT. SAILORS WANT LIQUOR AND THEIR DESIRES MUST BE CATERED TO.

REPLY TO POINT FIVE.

By what process of reasoning are sailors, as a class, to be treated differently with respect to liquor drinking, from soldiers, cowboys and plantation laborers ?

As the fact that "Honolulu is a seaport" is regularly trotted out and put through its paces, every time the liquor question is up for discussion, its exponents must have some theory upon which they base the claim that sailors should be singled out from the mass of citizens, and blessed, or cursed, according to the viewpoint, with the opportunity to buy intoxicating liquor on different terms from their fellow citizens.

Has any one ever heard any reason advanced in support of the assertion ? What reason can there be ?

Is it because a sailor is so used to his daily grog, that he simply **MUST** have it, or go off with the jimjams ?

That might once have been an explanation, if not a reason, in the days when not only merchant ships but naval vessels also, served rum to the crew as a part of the daily ration; but that practice no longer obtains.

As a matter of fact, prohibition of the saloon has already gone into effect on shipboard, so far as the sailors are concerned. Daily grog has been cut out of the sea ration.

The decks may be wet, but the liquor glasses in the fo'csl are "dry," from one end of a voyage to the other.

The intimation incident to the theory that seaports must sell liquor, is, that if the saloons were closed, sailors would boycott the town.

Would they ? If that is the theory, why would they boycott the town without saloons any more than they boycott the ship which has no liquor supply ?

The fact that sailors do not boycott ships where liquor is not on sale, in which ships they are confined for months at a time, demonstrates that they will not boycott towns which do not license saloons, in which towns they incidentally stay for a few hours or days, in the course of a voyage.

The fact of the matter is, that the assertion that sailors and seaports must be treated differently from inland towns, when it comes to liquor regulation, is one of the ancient, worn out, stale, flat, unprofitable and untrue sayings

which has been repeated so often that mere repetition has given it a semblance of truth. All that is needed to demonstrate its untruth is to analyze it.

For thousands of years the assertion was made that the sun revolved around the earth, and the assertion was received as fundamental truth, until Galileo challenged it. To be sure he had to recant under threat of torture; but the old theory was destroyed, only to be revived by a South Carolina darky preacher, who, a few years ago gained national fame, and added to the joys of life, by a sermon entitled "De Sun Do Move."

The theory that a sailor is a natural born tough, with an insatiable thirst for straight liquor, and that he will "yump his yob" if deprived of whisky, is as obsolete as the theory that "de sun do move."

Sailors do not come to Honolulu to buy liquor. They come because the ships on which they are employed have business here. They will continue to sail on prohibition ships; and ships will continue to come to Hawaii as long as freight and passengers are available at paying rates, regardless of our liquor laws.

Instead of liquor selling being permitted **BECAUSE** Honolulu is a seaport town, if any difference is to be made by reason of its being a fact, it should rather be that temptation to drink should be removed, by decreasing the opportunities to drink.

Is there any one who will deny that it would be better for seamen themselves, as well as for the rest of the community, if drinking could be reduced among seamen to the "lowest practicable minimum"?

Many seamen drink, not because they want to do so, but because it is the custom and because such pressure is brought upon them to drink that it is practically impossible for them to resist.

Many sailors would welcome the change; and certainly a sober waterfront would be a welcome change to shipowners and captains, as well as to those having business in that quarter.

The plea that liquor must continue to be sold in Honolulu because it is a seaport, is the plea of the unthinking repeater of platitudes; or of the man who fears that sailors would drink less liquor in a saloonless Honolulu than in a town which publicly invites Jack to drink, usually to his detriment—too often to his destruction.

SIXTH OBJECTION TO PROHIBITION.

"**PROHIBITION WILL NOT PROHIBIT**"; (Meaning thereby that prohibition will not prevent the use of liquor.) "**MORE LIQUOR WILL BE SOLD UNDER PROHIBITION THAN UNDER A LICENSE LAW.**"

This is another of the stock phrases that is habbled off without thought, by those who, for whatever reason, object to prohibition of the sale of liquor.

TWO CLASSES WHO OPPOSE PROHIBITION.

There are two classes who oppose prohibition.

First, those who are making a profit out of the business, directly or indirectly;

Second, certain honest but narrow-minded persons who have a maximum conception of their "rights," and a minimum conception of their obligations and responsibilities toward their fellowmen.

REPLY TO FIRST CLASS.

The reply to this objection differs with the class which makes it.

The reply to the liquor dealer, who wails that the proposed law will increase liquor sales and consumption, is, "It is to laugh!"

"Since when did you become so tender conscienced that it gives you pain to think that more liquor will be consumed, thereby increasing the profits of the liquor dealers?"

"Boys and young men now drink the liquor which you sell, and wreck their young manhood thereby.

"You know it; but you keep on selling to them just the same. You do not try to reduce the amount you sell to them. On the contrary you try to increase it.

"The more you sell the more you profit!

"The more you sell the better you like it!

"Why are you now suddenly smitten with the fear that a law may go into effect which will increase the liquor dealers profit?"

A WOLF AND THE SHEEP.

The best parallel that I can think of is a flock of sheep which has been stricken with an epidemic of scab. It is proposed to "dip" them in a medicated bath, in order to stop the scab. Suddenly a wolf, who has been fattening on the dead and dying sheep, breaks out of the forest and sets up a howl against dipping, on the ground that it will not cure scab; on the contrary it will aggravate it.

A LYING HYPOCRITE.

Would not the proper answer to the wolf be: "You infernal lying hypocrite! The sheep are already dying, and you are growing fat on their misery and death. You are not interested in saving sheep. Your interest lies in having more sheep die!"

To apply the parallel—the liquor dealer is not interested in REDUCING the number of liquor drinkers, and REDUCING the amount of liquor consumed. His interests are bound up with INCREASING the number of drinkers and the amount of liquor consumed.

When, therefore, you hear a liquor dealer waxing eloquent over the argument that prohibition ought to be defeated, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT PROHIBIT, BUT WILL INCREASE THE CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR, just tag him as a wolf whose heart is bowed down with sorrow, because he is afraid that dipping may kill the sheep.

REPLY TO SECOND CLASS.

The reply to the second class—the narrow men who quote scripture to justify drinking; who would rather see Hawaii “free than sober”; who value their own “liberty” to do as they please, more than they do the soul of their neighbor who may be damned to hell by reason of that “liberty”—the reply to this class of men, who frequently are sincere, is different.

STICK TO THE TEXT.

To them I say “stick to the text.”

The object of a law prohibiting the sale of liquor, is **NOT TO STOP** liquor selling or liquor consumption. No one expects it!—not even the most ardent prohibition fanatic who ever walked!

To the end of time, there will probably be some men who will crave alcoholic liquor, and there will be other men, who, for the purpose of making a dollar’s profit, will furnish it, law or no law!

The object of a law prohibiting the sale of liquor is not to **STOP** drinking altogether; but to try and “**REDUCE THE CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR TO THE LEAST PRACTICABLE MINIMUM.**”

This phase of the question has been argued in detail in an earlier article of this series; but it is just as well to restate it here, in connection with the objection that “prohibition does not prohibit.”

PROHIBITION DOES NOT PROHIBIT, BUT IT LESSENS.

Prohibition does not prohibit, but it lessens, the consumption of liquor, precisely as a law against murder, theft, assault and all the other crimes, does not stop the commission of those crimes; but it **DOES** tend to lessen their frequency.

Because prohibition of the sale of liquor does not wholly stop such sale, Mr. Hypocritical Wolf and Mr. Narrow Sincerity set up the cry—“Prohibition does not Prohibit! Repeal the law!”

As well advocate the repeal of all laws against crime, because they fail to prevent all crime!

To Mr. Narrow Sincerity, I say that it stands to reason that more liquor will be sold and consumed, where it is sold lawfully and openly, within sight and smell of the sidewalk, on the principal streets, in the pathway of thousands, whose wills are weak or powerless to resist, than will be the case of it is outlawed—driven out of sight, into back alleys, cellars and concealed cubbyholes behind barred trapdoors.

“SNEAKS AND LIARS.”

Bishop Restarick fears that a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor will “make sneaks and liars” out of some previously reputable and

upright citizens. I suggest to the good Bishop that some men may act the "sneak" and "lie" to obtain a drink of whisky when there is a prohibition law in force; but the prohibition law is not what will make them "liars and sneaks"; it will simply smoke the "sneaks and liars" out, and show them up in their true colors.

Any man (except one who is so addicted to drink that he is no longer a free agent, but the victim of a disease) who will perjure himself and act the sneak for the simple purpose of getting a drink, only lacks the opportunity to do the sneak-and-liar act in any other directions where his appetite or his desires may lead.

FOXES AND PILLARS OF THE CHURCH.

A dog which sneaks a chicken out of the backyard will sneak a ham out of the kitchen or a turkey off the dinner table if it gets the chance.

"Sneaks and Liars" and confirmed drunks, as well as some of the pillars of the church and society, will patronize "speak easies" and "holes in the wall," as well as more questionable resorts, but there are many, and yet many, men who will not do so, who would be tempted to their destruction by the open saloon; many who will not drink, or will drink less, if there is no available public place with its air of sociability extending an invitation to the passerby.

Remember the text!

PROHIBITION WILL NOT PROHIBIT, BUT IT WILL LESSEN THE AMOUNT OF LIQUOR SOLD, and thereby tend to secure the desired object, viz: It will tend "to reduce the consumption of liquor to the lowest practicable minimum."

SEVENTH OBJECTION TO PROHIBITION.

IT IS UNFAIR LEGISLATION, BECAUSE IT PREVENTS THE POOR MAN FROM GETTING LIQUOR, WHILE PERMITTING THE RICH MAN TO IMPORT ALL HE WANTS.

A FAKE OBJECTION.

The answer to this objection, so far as most who make it are concerned, is, that it is a fake objection, having no truth, logic or sincerity in it.

It is on a par with the argument that we ought to defeat prohibition because Mr. Woolley wants it. Both of these arguments, by the way, are being fed out to the native people, by the Liquor Dealers' Association, through the medium of a special weekly edition of the Bulletin, in Hawaiian, and an alleged story paper being published in the name of John Wise, who has been hired to spread the doctrine that drinking liquor is good for Hawaiians, and who is industriously earning his salary.

The two arguments named are being used more than any and all others. They indicate the high character of those who are opposing prohibition "on principle."

TO THE FEW SINCERE DOUBTERS.

As to the few who have some feeling that "discrimination" is involved, the reply is that there is no more discrimination in this respect than there is in hundreds of other cases, both through legislation and through natural causes or the force of circumstances.

A multimillionaire can do many things and go scot free, that would, if done by most of the rest of us, land us in jail. Is that any reason for repealing, or failing to enact just laws that by their terms apply equally to all men?

John Rockefeller and the Standard Oil Company have done many things which have entailed fine and imprisonment upon many poorer men and smaller concerns. Is that any reason for repealing the criminal laws and the laws against granting railroad rebates and the laws against trusts?

STEAM YACHTS AND AUTOMOBILES.

A rich man can buy a steam yacht or an automobile, while a poor man can not, because he has not money enough.

A rich man can own a piano, but a poor man has to be contented to whistle a tune with his own mouth, or listen to Berger's band.

GOVERNMENT TO PAY THE TAXES.

It is not because of the law that this is so, but simply because some men have more money than others. It always has been so and always will be so, until somebody can think up some kind of a law which will make us all rich.

I refer the objectors under this point, to the candidate for the legislature who promised the voters that if they would elect him, he would have a law passed repealing all tax laws, and requiring the government to pay the taxes.

IMPORTING WILL BE ONLY TOO EASY.

As a matter of fact, as we shall learn to our sorrow, if prohibition goes into effect, any man with a dollar can "import" all the liquor he will pay for, at but little more cost than he now gets it. The liquor dealers and the express companies will speedily work out the details.

As a further matter of fact, this same "right to import" is today the greatest obstacle to the successful enforcement of prohibition, throughout the United States, in the States, counties and towns, which have passed laws prohibiting the sale of liquor.

The liquor dealers and the express companies and other high-minded citizens, who "on principle" believe in personal "liberty" and the inalienable right to get drunk, will combine as they do elsewhere in the Union, to defeat and nullify the prohibition law by every possible device and subterfuge.

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION.

One of the vital questions before the country and before congress, today, is the securing of the passage by congress of a law which will file the teeth and clip the claws of these high-minded gentry, and make it a federal offense to ship alcoholic liquor from any State into any other State where, under local law, prohibition is in force.

PROBABLE HYSTERICS OF "LIBERTY" LOVERS.

The bare suggestion of such a frightful contingency, will probably give our "liberty" loving friends the hysterics, as being an infringement of our territorial rights.

Let them calm themselves with the reflection that "Puritan Maine" has joined hands with "Fire-eating South Carolina," "Hair-Trigger Texas," "Bleeding Kansas" and the frozen Dakotas, together with "good Americans and true" from every other State in the Union to secure the passage by congress of this very law, and what is more, there is every indication that the law will be enacted at an early date.

What does not worry the people of these liberty-loving States, as an "invasion of State rights," need not alarm the newly-created Americans of Hawaii.

Another thought is, that it would be a good thing for the Territory if it were a fact that only the rich could secure liquor by importing it. Unfortunately nearly every one who chooses to go to the trouble can get it.

RIGHT OF IMPORTATION AN OBSTACLE TO BE OVERCOME.

Instead of this being a reason for abandoning the prohibition proposition however, it is simply one of the many obstacles to be overcome.

So long as we believe that the object sought is sound and right, viz.: the "reduction of the consumption of liquor to the lowest practicable minimum," we must not be frightened off by obstacles.

Nothing worth having is obtained without effort.

LIBERTY BEFORE SOBRIETY.

The "liberty before sobriety" advocates will probably say: "What do you want prohibition for, if anybody can import liquor at about the same price now paid?"

To them I again quote the text which is the warp, the woof and the whole fabric of the prohibition argument:

"Prohibition will not Prohibit, but it will lessen the consumption of liquor."

WHAT ABOLITION OF THE SALOON WILL ACCOMPLISH.

Abolition of the saloon will not prevent those who wish to obtain liquor, from making their own swipes, patronizing blind pigs or importing it from Cali-

fornia; but it will do away with the ever present, public invitation to drink, which a saloon presents in such a seductive manner as to be irresistible to hundreds of men, who fall, and who, but for the presence of the saloon, would not succumb, and would not deliberately, and of malice aforethought, go to the trouble of importing liquor, or incur the bother and risk of hunting out and patronizing a blind pig.

In other words, in spite of the power of importation which will still remain to every inhabitant of Hawaii, poor as well as rich, the abolition of the open, public, legalized saloon will tend to reduce drinking to the "lowest practicable minimum," and that is what we are seeking.

IMPORTATION NOT THE PRESENT ISSUE.

And yet this one more reply:

Hawaii has not the power to prevent the importation of liquor. Congress alone can do that for either Maine, Texas, South Carolina or any other State or Territory; but HAWAII CAN, BY THE GRACE OF CONGRESS, HERE AND NOW, DECIDE WHETHER SHE WILL PERMIT THE PUBLIC SALOON TO EXIST WITHIN HER BORDERS!

THIS, AND THIS ALONE, IS THE QUESTION NOW BEFORE US FOR DECISION.

One step at a time.

We can not expect to do everything at once.

A man can not run a mile in three jumps.

Recognizing that the power of importation is something to be fought, in the future, but now beyond our reach, what we can now do, is to decisively order the saloon off the map of Hawaii. Then, having done all within our power, we can turn our attention to the next point, and, together with the other prohibition States and Territories, camp on the trail of congress, until we secure from it the next step in securing the "reduction of the consumption of liquor to the lowest practicable minimum," viz.: the prohibition by congress, of the importation of alcoholic liquor, from any State or Territory, into any other State or Territory which prohibits the sale of alcoholic liquor within its borders

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 279 722